



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/869,122	06/25/2001	Shohei Tanaka	Q64929	2326

7590 12/18/2002  
Sughrue Mion Zinn Macpeak & Seas  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20037

EXAMINER

HUI, SAN MING R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1617

20

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/869,122

Applicant(s)

TANAKA ET AL.

Examiner

San-ming Hui

Art Unit

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 26, 2002 has been entered.

The cancellation of claims 7 and 9-13 in amendment filed September 26, 2002 is acknowledged. The amendments filed September 26, 2002 have been entered.

Claims 14-21 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isomura et al. (US Patent 4,990,503 from the Information Disclosure Statement received September 20, 2001) in view of Aparicio et al. (Leukemia, 1998;12:220-229 from the IDS received June 27, 2002) and Shipman et al. (British Journal of Haematology, 1997;98:665-672 from the IDS received September 20, 2001).

Isomura et al. teaches the heterocyclic bisphosphonic acid compounds, useful as bone resorption inhibitors, including 1-hydroxy-2-(imidazo[1,2a]pyridin-3-yl)ethane-1,1-bisphosphonic acid can be blended with other pharmaceutically acceptable carrier to form medical composition suitable for oral administration (See particularly Col. 7, line 7-19; col. 9, example 5). Isomura et al. also teaches that 1-hydroxy-2-(imidazo[1,2a]pyridin-3-yl)ethane-1,1-bisphosphonic acid possess a strong bone resorption inhibition activities which can be used in diseases such as metastatic osteocarcinoma (See col. 6, line 4-66, particularly Table 1). Isomura et al. also teaches the oral dosage of 1-hydroxy-2-(imidazo[1,2a]pyridin-3-yl)ethane-1,1-bisphosphonic acid to be useful in inhibiting bone resorption to be 0.1 to 10mg daily (See col. 7, line 7-19).

Isomura et al. does not expressly teach 1-hydroxy-2-(imidazo[1,2a]pyridin-3-yl)ethane-1,1-bisphosphonic acid is useful in a method of inhibiting proliferation of myeloma cells. Isomura et al. does not expressly teach the effective dosage of 1-hydroxy-2-(imidazo[1,2a]pyridin-3-yl)ethane-1,1-bisphosphonic acid to be 1 to 20 mg or 3 to 10 mg.

Aparicio et al. teaches two structurally different bisphosphonates: Aredia (pamidronate) and zoledronate, are effective in suppressing bone resorption and in inducing apoptosis in multiple myeloma cells by inducing apoptotic fragmentation (See the abstract; also page 223, col. 2, second paragraph). Aparicio et al. also teaches that both pamidronate and zoledronate are effective in inhibiting proliferation of multiple myeloma cells (See particularly page 226, col. 1, third paragraph).

Shipman et al. teaches three structurally different bisphosphonates: clodronate, pamidronate and YM 175, are effective in reducing the cell number of human myeloma cells (See page 667, Figure 1). Shipman et al. also teaches pamidronate and YM 175 as effective in inducing DNA fragmentation in myeloma cells (See page 668, col. 2, second paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ 1-hydroxy-2-(imidazo[1,2a]pyridin-3-yl)ethane-1,1-bisphosphonic acid, in the herein claimed dosage, in a method of inhibiting proliferation of myeloma cells and/or suppressing bone resorption herein.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ 1-hydroxy-2-(imidazo[1,2a]pyridin-3-yl)ethane-1,1-bisphosphonic acid, in the herein claimed dosage, in a method of both inhibiting proliferation of myeloma cells and/or suppressing bone resorption herein because various structurally distinct bisphosphonate compounds, pamidronate, zoledronate, clodronate, and YM 175, are known to be effective in inducing apoptosis in myeloma cells by inducing apoptotic fragmentation in myeloma cells. Possessing the teaching of the cited prior art, one of ordinary skill in the art would

be reasonably expected to employ any known bisphosphonate compound, including 1-hydroxy-2-(imidazo[1,2a]pyridin-3-yl)ethane-1,1-bisphosphonic acid, in the herein claimed method to inhibit the proliferation of myeloma cells and/or suppressing bone resorption. Furthermore, the optimization of result effect parameters (e.g., dosage range) is obvious as being within the skill of the artisan.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 14-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to San-ming Hui whose telephone number is (703) 305-1002. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon 9:00 to 1:00, Tu - Fri from 9:00 to 6:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, PhD., can be reached on (703) 305-1877. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4556 for regular communications and (703) 308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Application/Control Number: 09/869,122  
Art Unit: 1617

Page 6

San-ming Hui  
December 10, 2002

  
SREENI PADMANABHAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

12/13/02